



City of Seattle  
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods  
Bernie Agor Matsuno, Director



**King County**



## **HARBORVIEW MEDICAL CENTER MAJOR INSTITUTIONS STANDING CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Harborview Medical  
Center Major Institutions  
Standing Citizens  
Advisory Committee

### Members and Alternates

Larry Brouse – Chair  
Kristin O'Donnell  
John Dolan  
Frederick Scheetz  
Anne Fiske Zuniga  
Dorothy DeCoster  
E Anne Newcombe  
Maria Elena Vasquez  
Laura Van Houghten  
John C Koch  
James Ericson

### Ex-Officio Members

Steve Sheppard – DON  
Michael Dorcy – DPD  
Ted Klainer – Harborview  
Medical Center

### **MINUTES**

#### **Meeting #31**

Wednesday, November 20, 2013  
Harborview Medical Center  
Executive Board Room (# GEH 72)

### **Members Present**

Larry Brouse  
Frederick Scheetz  
Jim Erickson  
Kristin O'Donnell  
Maria Elena Vasquez

Anne Newcombe  
John Dolan  
Anne Fiske Zuniga  
Dotty DeCoster

### **Members Absent**

Laura Van Houghten

John Koch

### **Staff Present**

Steve Sheppard	City of Seattle, Department of Neighborhoods (ex officio member)
Ted Klainer	Harborview (ex-officio member)
Elise Chayet	Associate Administrator, Harborview
Michael Dorcy	City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development (ex-officio member)

### **Others Present**

(see sign-in sheet)

### **1. Welcome, Introduction of New Members**

The meeting was opened by Larry Brouse. Brief introductions followed.

Steve Sheppard noted that the City had solicited and was appointing new members to the Committee to fill the vacant positions. He then introduced the new members of the Committee. The new members are: Dorothy DeCoster, Jim Erickson, James Koch, Laura Van Houghton and Maria Elena Vasquez.



## **2. Overview of the Present Adaptive Reuse Plans for the Harborview Hall**

Kathie Brown, Facilities Director for King County introduced the Development Team that will present an overview of the present Adaptive Reuse Plans for Harborview Hall.

Eileen DeArmon from Sabey Corporation informed the Committee that it has been over a year since the Committee met, and she would like to emphasize that Sabey Corporation was selected by King County to work through the phases of this project, and assigned to put together a concept plan to begin this process. She then introduced John Jex to go over the present plans.

John Jex, an architect from Callison made a brief presentation of the Adaptive Reuse Plans for the Harborview Hall. The Adaptive Reuse Plan for Harborview Hall will utilize the existing façade on 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the existing square footage of the original Harborview Hall which is from the 1930's. It was designed for the nurses' residence. It is about 95,000 sq. ft. of physical structure. Also, the adaptive reuse plan adds new construction on the east side of the structure, making the original façade safe and putting in place emergency stairs, new vertical circulation, elevators, and a complete new electrical and mechanical infrastructure and services. This comprises the adaptive reuse portion. He noted that the new structure will be about 166,000 gross square feet.

Mr. Jex then went over the design of the open space proposed to the east of Harborview Hall. He noted that the design will emphasize the linkage to Terrace Street. This will bring a very inviting presence to the building. This new plaza will be a central feature for the benefit of the neighbors with convenient access to the campus features such as the parking garage, research buildings, the firehouse, Harborview Hall and condominiums.

Mr. Jex introduced Steve Shay to present and briefly explain the design of the plaza. Mr. Jex illustrated that the Firehouse is an integral function of the plaza as a community benefit feature. Part of the overall development of Harborview Hall will encourage restoration of the firehouse and development of this as a community feature. Currently, majority of the firehouse is occupied by County and Harborview services. The proposal is to move these services out of the firehouse and make it available to the community purposes in the first floor, thus engaging community space.

Steve Shay mentioned that John Jex talked about the catalyst for collecting circulation for a vibrant community space, identifying where the major circulation might go and Steve emphasized that the design of the plaza does this. There will be accenting new sidewalks from Terrace Street, allowing people to gather and move around the plaza. The plaza will create a variety of space, vibrant, exciting and a very porous central element. There will be benches throughout the plaza area as well as directional lighting. The existing trees will be staying and the plaza will be open from three different sides.

A brief back and forth discussion occurred regarding the design. During this discussion it was noted that there would be new sidewalks along both Terrace and Terry, adjacent to the plaza. It was noted that the plaza would also have to accommodate service vehicle but that this use would be minimal.

Mr. Shay noted that one other feature of the orientation of the plaza design is that it faces down towards the south with an unobstructed access to the south that increases the sun that the plaza gets throughout the year.

Mr. Shay noted that on the south side of Harborview Hall, we will be maintaining the pedestrian access around from the plaza to the 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and on the north side, a new access, providing paving landscape features and upgrade that would improve and lighten the 9<sup>th</sup> avenue streetscape.

### **3. Presentation on the Rationale for Requesting a Minor Amendment**

Steve Sheppard stated that whenever the proponent or owner of the master plan (which in this case is Harborview and the County) believes that they need to make a change to the adopted master plan; there is a process to request an amendment. The Department of Planning and Development (DPD) issues an interpretation after the request for an amendment as to whether it is an exempt, major or minor amendment to the plan. There are criteria for major and minor amendment plans in the code. The proposal process requires the Committee to make a recommendation whether it is a minor or major amendment. Mr. Sheppard also informed the Committee that a memorandum has been distributed summarizing why the proponent believes it is minor amendment.

Jack McCullough from the law firm of McCullough Hill and Leary was recognized to present the County's rationale for requesting that the retention of Harborview Hall be considered a minor Amendment to the Harborview Medical Center Major Institution Master Plan. Mr. McCullough stated that he has been working with King County and Sabey. Mr. McCullough noted that the city modified the major institutions ordinance in the 90's when the first major institution ordinance was adopted and it was project specific. The process identifying these changes was a geographically focus. This was changed and moved towards a global view of the campus and try to assess how development would take place dynamically overtime.

Mr. McCullough briefly discussed the criteria for a minor or major amendment. He noted that for a minor amendment, it should be consistent to the original intent of the adopted master plan; and that it will not result in a significant greater impact than is contemplated in the adopted master plan. Major renovation is required for Harborview Hall but its development would still be allowed under the overall square footage allowed. The project would add an additional 70,000 sq. ft. There is about 200,000 sq. ft. +/- of unused development capacity. Thus, Mr. McCullough stated that it is the proponent's conclusion that this projects meets the qualification for a minor amendment to the adopted master plan, and have requested such a determination.

Mr. McCullough then described the criteria for a major amendment. He noted that the proposed amendment would neither increase height designations, expand boundaries of the MIO, change any development standard to be less restrictive, involve reduction in housing, change the SOV goal of the adopted Transportation Management Plan (TMP), nor require modification to any use of any required council conditional use approval such as a heli-stop. Thus, this proposal does not satisfy the conditions for a major amendment. He stated tht it is his conclusion the proposal is a minor amendment.

He directed the Committee's attention of his Memorandum of October 13, 2101 to DPD. (Memorandum attached to these minutes.

It was noted that if this is determined to be a minor amendment, the project will proceed through the master use program subject to whatever conditions are imposed under the MIMP. If it is a major amendment, the process will start over and it would go through that is equivalent to adopting a new MIMP.

Members asked for clarification concerning use of Harborview Hall and how that might relate to any amendment. It was noted that the use of the area was changed from open space to medical office. Steve Sheppard responded that the code was changed in 1996 to forgo requiring a specific use on any one site. Harborview is under that version of the Code. Therefore the simple change of use would not likely trigger a major amendment. If there had been uses that were specified as a council use, then, the criteria might trigger a major amendment occurring, but there aren't. There is a separate section of the Major Institution ordinance that talks about the major institution use. The uses have to functional related to the purpose of the major institution. What is functional related means? There are six criteria: tenant improvement, relationship to the mission, etc.

Various members also asked for clarification concerning the proponent of the action and who actually has the authority to make requests for amendments. Steve Sheppard responded that when a master plan is updated or proposed, it is the institution that is responsible for developing the plan. It is that same entity that is responsible for making the formal amendment request. The plan applies to a geographic area. Individual non-institutional owners have the right to build the development standards that were adopted by the major institution plan, but they cannot request changes to the plan.

Larry Brouse asked members if they wished to proceed with adopting their formal recommendation or have time to consider the information presented and return at a later date to take that action. Members uniformly stated that they believed that more time was needed to carefully consider this issue.

Steve Sheppard asked the County if the formal request for interpretation already been submitted? The County mentioned that the request for the application has been made. Mr. Sheppard asked if there is a time limit for the Committee's recommendation. The County informed the Committee that it is 120 days and the 120 days started on November 7<sup>th</sup>.

Larry Brouse noted that the Committee requested for information such as parking, economics and the feasibility of the office and has not received this information. Members agreed with Mr. Brouse's observation and requested tht additional information be made available.

#### **4. Adjournment.**

The follow-up meeting date was set for December 11. No further business being before the Committee; the meeting was adjourned.

*Editor's note: Due to scheduling difficulties the date of the follow-up meeting was changed to January 15, 2014.*